DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 336 HE 004 493

AUTHOR Williamson, W. J.
TITLE The Commuting Student Study, Report III: Lounge Space.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Commuting Students; *Higher Education; *Leisure Time; Physical Facilities; *Recreational Facilities; Research Projects; *Student Unions
IDENTIFIERS *University of Alberta

ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis of the free time on campus utilization of lounging space at the University of Alberta. Data were collected by a questionnaire limited to student life outside of the instruction time. Results indicated: (1) next to student study, lounging space is the most important informal time need; (2) students from many faculties reported intensive use of large centralized lounge areas; (3) student satisfaction with lounges is highest for the newest and/or largest lounges or for space offering the best lounging qualities; and (4) the student description of the ideal student lounge describes centralized and decentralized space of high physical and environmental qualities. Appendices of related material are included. Related documents are HE 004 494, HE 004 491, HE 004 526 and HE 004 492. (MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 493

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA EDMONTON 7, ALBERTA

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081336

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

REPORT III -- LOUNGE SPACE

PREPARED FOR THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AT THE

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SUBMITTED BY

WM. J. WILLIAMSON, RESEARCH OFFICER

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING

ABSTRACT

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning has undertaken a study which focuses on the needs of the students--with prime emphasis on the needs of the commuting student. This study is somewhat unique in that it has provided a phenomenal amount of data--as expressed directly by the students.

Reports II to VI deal with a detailed analysis of the free time, (i.e., non-classroom time) on campus utilization of space. The areas of concern were studying, eating, lounging, recreation and service and commercial facilities, with an analysis of each of these free time activities based on the amount of use, satisfaction and perceived need.

Report III concerns itself with lounge areas. The findings are as follows:

1. Next to student study, lounging space is the most important student informal time need.

2. Students from many faculties reported intensive use of large centralized lounge areas such as found in Students' Union and Central Academic. Smaller decentralized lounges receive lower use in terms of the overall sample, a fact which appears to be due to crowding, noise and the lack of a relaxed atmosphere. Decentralized student lounges are used more by students from faculties or departments located in the surrounding areas.

3. Reported student satisfaction with lounges is highest for the newest and/or largest lounges (Central Academic and Students' Union) or

for space offering the best lounging (relaxation and communication) qualities. There was a noticeable drop in reported satisfaction with crowded basement lounges.

4. The student description of the ideal student lounge describes centralized and decentralized space of high physical and environmental qualities. As there obviously exists at least two different student needs with respect to lounging, big central lounges commonly used for "people-watching" are acceptable to many students while smaller quieter decentralized non-basement lounges are required by many other students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study, as one in a series of campus informal student space studies, was conceived and performed by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, in response to a need apparent in the Long Range Development Plan of the University of Alberta. Gratefully acknowledged is the valuable assistance provided by Dr. Wm. A. Preshing, Dr. David Otto, Mr. Ken Coull, Miss Judy Brunt, Mr. Bill Buxton and Miss Iris Jackson. Without their help this study would not have been possible. Thanks also goes to Mrs. Minnie Cutts who typed the report.

The cooperation of Administrative Data Processing has been very important to the study and is greatly appreciated. Last but not least, our sincere thanks to the students who completed the questionnaire and shared with us their views on campus life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Space Study -- Detailed Introduction	3
III.	Characteristics of the Sample	4
IV.	Brief Examination of the Time Question	10
V.	Detailed Examination of Lounge Facilities	11
	(a) General Observations	11
	(b) Use of Lounge Facilities	15
	(c) Lounge Satisfaction	24
	(d) Core Question and Comments	28
VI.	Student Description of the Ideal Lounge	31
	(a) Student Lounge Space Physical and Service Features Summary	31
VII.	Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations	38
APPENDIX I.	Student Comments	40

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	5
II.	Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	6
III.	Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment	7
IV.	Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment	8
V.	Survey Respondents Place of Residence	9
VI.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I	12
VII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II	13
VIII.	Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III	14
IX-I.	Lounge Facilities Response	18
IX-II.	Lounge Facilities Response	19
IX-III.	Lounge Facilities Response	20
X-I.	Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)	21
X-II.	Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)	22
X-III.	Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)	23
XI-I.	Detailed Lounge Facilities Response	25

TABLE		PAGE
XI-II.	Detailed Lounge Facilities Response	27
XII.	Summary of Responses in Areas of Complaint Question 69, Sample I & II	30
XIII-I.	Samples I & II Total Itemized Comments Question 66 . .	32
XIII-II.	Samples I & II Total Comments Question 66	33
XIV-I.	Campus Buildings & Lounges Mentioned - Sample I . . .	36
XIV-II.	Campus Buildings and Lounges Mentioned - Sample II . .	37

COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

REPORT III -- LOUNGE SPACE

I. Introduction

The University of Alberta has traditionally been thought of as a residential institution. In fact, as early as 1911, when Athabasca Hall was built it housed both staff and students as well as serving as a library, gymnasium, and administrative office for the three year old university. Since that time the University has undergone a massive change. The enrolment has mushroomed from 185 students in 1911 to 18,336 in 1971. The growth of the metro Edmonton area has been extensive and as these changes manifest themselves it is necessary for the University to change. Whereas in 1911, when the first residence was built, 23% of the students were in residence, in 1971 only 12% of those enrolled lived in on-campus residences. It is apparent that some consideration, because of this shift from a resident institution to a non-resident one, must be given in the planning and development of space facilities responsive to commuting student needs. Because the University is no longer able to provide on-campus living accommodation for a major portion of student population, it must look at its obligation to provide on-campus non-class activities for those students who must commute to campus.

With these thoughts in mind the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has undertaken a critical examination of the commuting student phenomenon on the University of Alberta campus.

In our approach to this study we have made certain basic assumptions

regarding students in general. Firstly, we assumed that students have certain basic human needs which must be met to sustain their life, needs which are taken care of (at least quantitatively, to some degree) by existing facilities within the present buildings. However, because our subjects are students of advanced scholarship they have additional needs that distinguish them from other human beings. They need places to study, relax, and places where they can talk meaningfully with their peers. In our study we have attempted to look at the time students spend on campus outside of the classroom. We have tried to separate the resident from the non-resident student in anticipation that the space needs of these two groups although similar, are not the same.

The initial report, Patterns in University Commuting (June, 1971), indicated the following trends: (1) an overall population increase in the urban Edmonton area, (2) an increase in commuters using all modes of transportation but especially the bus which in most cases increased the amount of commuting time, (3) an increase in the number of students in the 25+ age group, and an increase in the number of married students with added family responsibilities, and (4) an increase in the demand for jobs both on and off campus. It is obvious from these findings that an effort must be made to deal with the extensive change in student patterns of university life. A final report will deal with the behavioural aspects of these changes.

In reports II to VII, we shall examine space usage and needs, concentrating on the students' use of on-campus space during their free time. These activities are divided as follows: (i) assessment of existing

facilities for free time activities and the usage of these facilities by the students, (ii) an assessment of present satisfaction of these facilities as stated by the students (see questionnaire), (iii) an assessment of the perceived needs as stated by the students and finally, (iv) a look at the discrepancies between the existing facilities and the types of facilities the students feel they need. We then focus our attention on the needs of the commuter in an attempt to find out what his problems are and how they are being met by the University as it now exists.

II. Space Study--Detailed Introduction

This study is concerned with student needs, and how these needs can be met in terms of space and facility planning. In reading the questionnaire we have devised, it becomes apparent that our investigation is limited to student life outside of the instruction time. This is intentional. We do acknowledge that a student's top priority is most probably his academic instruction. Indeed many a participant in our study used the questionnaire as a vehicle for expressing his beefs and bouquets about the type of education he was receiving. We do believe that the quality of a student's university experience outside of the classroom is of vital importance, and warrants a critical examination in itself. It is hoped that the approach and methodology we have taken does justice to this largely uncharted area. Classroom and other formal educational space is of course, already tied to a reliable building planning system. The questionnaire developed as we attempted to gain insights into a number of large questions we felt were important to ask regarding a student's life

outside of the classroom. These questions were as follows:

1. How do students spend their free time on campus?
2. Where do they spend their free time?
3. How much do they use these facilities?
4. Are they satisfied with these facilities?
5. What are some of the other related aspects of facility use?
6. Is there a differential use of these facilities?
7. What can the University planners do to assist the students' space needs?

III. Characteristics of the Sample

The following Tables, I-V, compare the students surveyed by the questionnaire with the total University full-time day-winter session enrolment of 1970-1971.

Inspection of these tables show that generally the Commuting Student sample is representative of the University enrolment. Specifically, Table I shows all faculties to be well represented in the survey with the possible exception of students from the professional faculties including Dentistry, Library Science, Medicine and Graduate Studies.

With regards to Table II, the age of those students surveyed was generally older (mean survey age 20.5 years) than the related total University enrolment. This was interpreted as a definite asset, as the students surveyed had experienced University space facilities for a longer period of time. Of the students surveyed more female students were involved relative to the total University enrolment.

TABLE I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Faculty Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

FACULTY	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No. of Students	% of Survey	No. of Students	% of Total
Arts	265	20.7	3,091	16.9
Agriculture	30	2.3	422	2.3
Business Administration & Commerce	75	5.9	1,118	6.1
College St. Jean	1	0.1	88	0.5
Dental Hygiene	3	0.2	50	0.3
Dentistry	4	0.3	197	1.1
Education	309	24.1	4,236	23.1
Engineering	98	7.6	1,380	7.5
Home Economics	29	2.3	324	1.7
Law	14	1.1	366	2.0
Library Science	-	-	44	0.2
Medical Laboratory Science	8	0.6	88	0.5
Medicine	23	1.8	589	3.2
Nursing	16	1.2	240	1.3
Pharmacy	15	1.2	303	1.6
Physical Education	28	2.2	598	3.3
Rehabilitation Medicine	27	2.1	215	1.2
Science	225	17.6	2,830	15.4
Graduate Studies	112	8.7	2,157	11.8
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Age and Sex Distribution of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

AGE	NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL STUDENTS		NO. OF MALE STUDENTS	NO. OF FEMALE STUDENTS	TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
			No.	%			No.	%
16 to 19 years	122	135	257	20.0	2,896	2,853	5,749	31.3
20 to 21 years	215	234	449	35.0	2,879	2,208	5,087	27.7
22 to 25 years	233	117	350	27.3	3,272	1,048	4,320	23.6
26 to 30 years	91	34	125	9.8	1,472	379	1,851	10.1
31 to 40 years	52	29	81	6.3	676	312	988	5.4
41 to 50 years	7	8	15	1.2	142	147	289	1.6
Over 51 years	1	4	5	0.4	18	34	52	.3
TOTAL STUDENTS	721 - 56.2%	561 - 43.8%	1,282	100.0%	11,355 - 61.9%	6,981 - 28.1%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE III

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Marital Status of Survey Respondents cf. University Enrolment

MARITAL STATUS	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT**	
	No. of Students	%	No. of Students	%
Single	1,040	81.1	13,396	73.1
Married	227	17.7	4,940	26.9
Other Varied	15	1.2	*	*
*Included Above				
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

**Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE IV

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Home Address (Origin) of Survey Respondents cf. Total University Enrolment

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION	TOTAL SURVEY		TOTAL UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT*	
	No.	%	No.	%
Edmonton	728	56.8	11,336	61.8
Urban Alberta	193	15.1	2,569	14.0
Rural Alberta	207	16.1	2,435	13.3
Other Canada	58	4.5	1,123	6.1
United States	8	0.6	108	.6
Central and South America	5	0.4	76	.4
Europe and South Pacific	23	1.8	65	.4
Asia	52	4.1	520	2.8
Africa and Middle East	8	0.6	104	.6
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%	18,336	100.0%

*Based on Registrar's data.

TABLE V

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Survey Respondents Place of Residence

LOCATION	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT
University Residence	186	14.5
Home	592	46.2
Apartment	266	20.7
Suite or Sleeping Room	127	9.9
Student Coop Housing	25	2.0
Other	74	5.8
No Response	12	0.9
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

Table III shows that relatively more single students were surveyed than there are enrolled at University. Consequently, only 17.7% rather than 26.9% of the married students at the University of Alberta were surveyed.

Table IV, which shows the home origin of students surveyed in relation to total University enrolment, indicates that 88% are Albertans while the remaining 12% are from outside the province and in some cases Canada.

Table V, which shows the place of residence of students surveyed, indicates that 14.5% of the sample are on-campus residence students. More specifically, with respect to the very nature of this study 85% of those students surveyed live off-campus and are commuting from the various city points.

From examination of the five tables, it would appear that the respondents surveyed represent the University students' attitudes toward campus informal student space needs. The exception to this would appear to be a light return from the students of certain of the professional faculties, many of whom are likely married, have children and would therefore be as much in need of study and lounge space as those students surveyed.

IV. Brief Examination of the Time Question

The key question regarding the use of free time dealt with (a) the amount of time spent on campus engaged in free time activities, and (b) what percentage of this free time was spent in the use of study, eating, lounging, recreation and commercial facilities on campus. Student

informal campus time distribution (Tables VI, VII and VIII) highlight the student informal time findings. In subsequent reports, the time spent in each type of space will be discussed.

Regarding Table VI, it is noted that the average student surveyed spends approximately fifteen hours of informal time on campus which must be considered an important weekly informal time allocation. In keeping with this time allocation, student lounging time which is informal relaxation and communication, is receiving 16% to 17% of available informal time, and is second only to study time in importance as indicated in Table VII. Please note that in the case of Table VIII, only 1,094 of the 1,282 survey respondents could be identified as to faculty. This table, however, does indicate the predictable heavy academic load nature (hence more on-campus informal time) of certain faculties such as graduate studies, and the distribution of informal student time by faculties in general. Activities such as student teaching, Graduate Teaching Assistant employment, and hospital experience appear to explain part of the low campus informal time expenditure for certain Education, Graduate and Medical students.

V. Detailed Examination of Lounge Facilities

(a) General Observations

The student informal time distribution tables clearly show that next to studying, lounging is receiving the heaviest time allocation of those students surveyed. Furthermore, this holds true consistently

TABLE VI

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution I

TIME ALLOCATION	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS
Less than 3 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	232	18.1
From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	206	16.1
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	355	27.6
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	228	17.8
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	67	5.2
More than 48 Hours Per Week	78	6.1
No Response	38	3.0
TOTAL STUDENTS	1,282	100.0%

TABLE VII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution II

INFORMAL TIME USE CATEGORIES	AVERAGE TIME ALLOCATION IN PERCENT BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS						TOTAL PERCENT AND STUDENTS	
	Studying	Eating	Lounging	Recreation	Service and Commercial	Other	%	Students
From 0 to 12 Hours Per Week	42.3	19.0	21.7	10.2	2.7	4.1	100	516
From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	49.8	14.3	18.7	10.0	1.9	5.3	100	355
From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	54.0	12.8	16.6	10.0	2.4	4.2	100	288
From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	57.1	11.0	12.6	9.6	3.1	6.6	100	67
Sub Total Average	50.8	14.3	17.4	10.0	2.5	5.0	100	N/A
More than 48 Hours Per Week	50.5	8.8	11.6	11.1	3.3	14.7	100	78
Grand Total Average	50.7	13.2	16.2	10.2	2.7	7.0	100	N/A
TOTAL STUDENTS								1,244
No Response								38
TOTAL STUDENTS SURVEYED								1,282

TABLE VIII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970-71

Student Informal Campus Time Distribution III (Units are Students)

FACULTY	TIME ALLOCATION							TOTAL STUDENTS
	Less than 3 Hours Per Week	From 3 to 6 Hours Per Week	From 6 to 12 Hours Per Week	From 12 to 24 Hours Per Week	From 24 to 36 Hours Per Week	From 36 to 48 Hours Per Week	More than 48 Hours Per Week	
Agriculture	0	6	3	12	6	0	0	27 - 2.5%
Arts	13	35	39	86	44	9	5	231 - 21.1%
Business Administration & Commerce	2	10	9	15	17	9	3	65 - 5.9%
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 - .1%
Dental Hygiene	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 - .1%
Dentistry	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4 - .4%
Education	21	67	51	73	49	7	5	273 - 25.0%
Engineering	1	14	10	30	20	4	4	83 - 7.6%
Graduate Studies	13	13	6	20	15	17	12	96 - 8.8%
Household Economics	0	4	9	7	2	1	0	23 - 2.1%
Law	1	0	0	4	4	1	2	12 - 1.1%
Medical Laboratory Science	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6 - .5%
Medicine	5	7	5	4	1	0	1	23 - 2.1%
Nursing	0	4	3	6	1	0	0	14 - 1.3%
Pharmacy	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	8 - .7%
Physical Education	0	2	1	10	7	2	0	22 - 2.0%
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	3	5	4	6	1	1	21 - 1.9%
Science	7	26	37	56	38	13	7	184 - 16.8%
TOTAL	65 - 5.8%	199 - 18.2%	180 - 16.5%	331 - 30.3%	215 - 19.7%	64 - 5.8%	40 - 3.7%	1,094 - 100%

throughout increasing levels of student informal time allocations. Unlike studying, however, for increasingly larger student informal time allocations on campus, lounge time as a proportion of overall time declines. It therefore appears that the utility of lounging tends to decline (dependent upon individual student timetable, course loads, campus and time patterns) after an appreciable amount per week has been experienced.

For way of clarification, the reader of the report will note that data is often reported as Sample I and Sample II. This stems from the fact that commuting student Samples I and II were obtained in two different ways. Sample I was completed in the Students' Union Building in February, 1971, following a random selection and mail out invitation to students. Sample II was also handled by random selection from the student full-time day winter master file but was administered entirely by mail.

As the two samples subsequently proved to be very similar in many instances with respect to space needs, data was simply combined.

(b) Use of Lounge Facilities

An examination of the lounge use as shown in Tables IX and X will provide the reader with detailed student responses upon which the following lounge use comments are predicated.

The Students' Union lounges which have been the major student lounge areas on campus since 1967, were reported as receiving the highest student use at 63% of those surveyed (Table IX-I). This is not surprising as the Students' Union Building offers a considerable amount of good quality

lounge space at the hub of many varied and different student activities. An equally interesting figure is the 32% dis-use of Students' Union Building lounges by those students surveyed, indicating that a single facility doesn't answer every students need. Later sections of the report illuminate this point. Faculty usage, as indicated by Tables X-I --X-III, shows that 75% of the Physical Education students surveyed use the Students' Union Building relatively more than other faculties (Table X-II). This is likely due to the very close proximity of Physical Education to the Students' Union Building. Education students, who have more student lounge space than Arts students use the Students' Union Building 54.7% to 60.8% for Arts. Also it can be noted that graduate students and the Health Sciences students are light, or low, users of Students' Union lounges (Table X-II).

The Central Academic Building which opened for lounge use (not food) in December 1970, received an immediate heavy use of 61% of those students surveyed. This was due to the existing shortage of quality lounge space, the central location and a wide acceptance by students as indicated in this study. Equally interesting was the fact that dis-use of the Central Academic lounge by those students surveyed was on par with Students' Union at 33% (Table IX-II).

Lounge use by faculties (Tables X-I -- X-III) show that Commerce students are, relatively, the heaviest users of Central Academic lounge space which is a result of the proximity-convenience factor since they are located in the same building. Students from Engineering, Science and Household Economics are also heavy users of the lounges. Surprisingly

enough Arts students reported only slightly less use of Central Academic lounges than Students' Union Building even though the Arts Faculty is generally located closer to the Central Academic. However, for those Arts students that did use Central Academic it was of generally greater use-importance. Health Sciences student use-importance of Central Academic lounges is higher than for Students' Union lounges but still tends to lower levels of use.

Education (chiefly basement) student lounges received a usage of 30% of those students surveyed (Table IX-I) which is 7% more than the Education students in the study (Table X-I). The Education lounges, however, don't have quite the crowd drawing appeal of the Education library, which drew 20% (cf. 7%) non-Education students. This indicates that the Education lounges are more central to Education use than the library (67.3% -- Table X-I). Arts and Science students are moderate users of the Education lounges. Household Economics students' use is lighter than expected, and Commerce and Engineering students' use is interesting to note, indicating informal interdisciplinary mixing.

Lister Hall lounges, quite predictably, had a usage of only 15% which is the magnitude of the resident students in the sample. The lounges, therefore, are of major use to residence students only. The residence students in the study, on the other hand, also use the on-campus lounges to a surprisingly large degree. Students' Union lounges are used 69%, Central Academic 63% and Education lounges 25%, before, between, or after scheduled classes and labs.

Finally, from the written list that survey respondents provided

TABLE IX-I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Lounge Facilities Response

BUILDING OR LOCATION	IMPORTANCE--USE OF FACILITIES			SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
EDUCATION LOUNGE	High	80	6.2	Very Satisfied	45	3.5	Positive		
	Medium	142	11.1	Satisfied	190	14.8	Satisfaction	235	18.3
	Low	161	12.6	Neither	480	37.4	Neutral	480	37.4
	Don't Use	818	63.8	Dissatisfied	60	4.7	Negative		
	No Response	81	6.3	Very Dissatisfied	31	2.4	Satisfaction	91	7.1
				No Response	476	37.1	No Response	476	37.1
	TOTAL RESPONSE	1,282	100		1,282	100		1,282	100
SUB LOUNGE	High	99	7.7	Very Satisfied	78	6.1	Positive		
	Medium	310	24.2	Satisfied	431	33.6	Satisfaction	509	39.7
	Low	397	31.0	Neither	341	26.6	Neutral	341	26.6
	Don't Use	413	32.2	Dissatisfied	112	8.7	Negative		
	No Response	63	4.9	Very Dissatisfied	38	3.0	Satisfaction	150	11.9
				No Response	282	22.0	No Response	282	22.0
	TOTAL RESPONSE	1,282	100		1,282	100		1,282	100

TABLE IX-II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Lounge Facilities Response

BUILDING OR LOUNGE	IMPORTANCE--USE OF FACILITIES			SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
CENTRAL ACADEMIC	High	186	14.5	Very Satisfied	289	22.4	Positive		
	Medium	348	27.1	Satisfied	409	31.9	Satisfaction	696	54.3
	Low	251	19.6	Neither	269	21.0	Neutral	269	21.0
	Don't Use	423	33.0	Dissatisfied	13	1.0	Negative		
	No Response	74	5.8	Very Dissatisfied	5	0.4	Satisfaction	18	1.4
				No Response	299	23.3	No Response	299	23.3
	TOTAL RESPONSE	1,282	100		1,282	100		1,282	100

TABLE IX-III

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Lounge Facilities Response

BUILDING OR LOCATION	IMPORTANCE--USE OF FACILITIES			SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES			SATISFACTION SUMMARY		
		No.	%		No.	%		No.	%
Lister Hall	High	58	4.5	Very Satisfied	31	2.4	Positive		
	Medium	71	5.5	Satisfied	102	8.0	Satisfaction	133	10.4
	Low	60	4.7	Neither	546	42.6	Neutral	546	42.6
	Don't Use	969	75.6	Dissatisfied	14	1.1	Negative		
	No Response	124	9.7	Very Dissatisfied	19	1.5	Satisfaction	33	2.6
				No Response	570	44.5	No Response	570	44.5
	TOTAL RESPONSE	1,282	100		1,282	100		1,282	100
Decentralized Campus Lounges	High	39	45.6	Very Satisfied	18	21.3	Positive		
	Medium	34	39.6	Satisfied	48	56.2	Satisfaction	66	77.5
	Low	13	14.8	Neither	6	7.1	Neutral	6	7.1
	Don't Use			Dissatisfied	5	5.3	Negative		
	No Response			Very Dissatisfied	9	10.1	Satisfaction	14	15.4
				No Response			No Response		
	TOTAL RESPONSE	86	100		86	100		86	100

TABLE X-I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)

Education Lounge

FACULTY	FACULTY USE										TOTAL FACULTY USE AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENTS SURVEYED
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	3	2.0	3	0.9	18	2.5	10.0
Arts	7	9.9	13	10.1	22	15.0	42	12.1	180	25.4	15.8
Business Administration & Commerce	2	28.0	2	1.6	11	7.5	15	4.3	49	6.9	20.0
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0	0	0	1	0.7	1	0.3	0	0.0	33.3
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.6	0.0
Education	55	77.5	93	72.1	60	40.8	208	59.9	58	8.2	67.3
Engineering	0	0	3	2.3	8	5.4	11	3.2	65	9.2	11.2
Graduate Studies	3	4.2	7	5.4	5	3.4	15	4.3	82	11.6	13.4
Household Economics	1	1.4	0	0	6	4.1	7	2.0	17	2.4	24.1
Law	1	1.4	1	0.8	0	0	2	0.6	10	1.4	14.3
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0	0	0	1	0.7	1	0.3	5	0.7	12.5
Medicine	0	0	2	1.6	0	0	2	0.6	20	2.8	8.7
Nursing	0	0	1	0.8	3	2.0	4	1.2	7	1.0	25.0
Pharmacy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1.0	0.0
Physical Education	0	0	2	1.6	5	3.4	7	2.0	14	2.0	25.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	1.4	1	0.8	3	2.0	5	1.4	16	2.3	18.5
Science	1	1.4	4	3.1	19	12.9	24	6.9	156	22.0	10.7
TOTAL	71	100	129	100	147	100	347	100	709	100	

TABLE X-II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)

Students' Union Lounge

FACULTY	FACULTY USE										TOTAL FACULTY USE AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENTS SURVEYED
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Agriculture	1	1.1	3	1.1	14	4.1	18	2.6	4	1.1	60.0
Arts	14	15.6	65	24.0	82	24.0	161	22.9	60	16.3	60.8
Business Administration & Commerce	5	5.6	20	7.4	24	7.0	49	7.0	17	4.6	65.3
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.3	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.3	0.0
Dentistry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.1	0.0
Education	30	33.3	59	21.8	80	23.5	169	24.1	95	25.9	54.7
Engineering	7	7.8	26	9.6	25	7.3	58	8.3	20	5.4	59.2
Graduate Studies	5	5.6	7	2.6	19	5.6	31	4.4	69	18.8	27.7
Household Economics	3	3.3	4	1.5	9	2.6	16	2.2	8	2.2	55.2
Law	0	0	2	0.7	3	0.9	5	0.7	7	1.9	35.7
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0	1	0.4	3	0.9	4	0.6	3	0.8	50.0
Medicine	0	0	2	0.7	4	1.2	6	0.9	16	4.4	26.1
Nursing	1	1.1	2	0.7	3	0.9	6	0.9	5	1.4	37.5
Pharmacy	1	1.1	1	0.4	1	0.3	3	0.4	4	1.1	20.0
Physical Education	2	2.2	10	3.7	9	2.6	21	3.0	1	0.3	75.0
Rehabilitation Medicine	1	1.1	8	3.0	5	1.5	14	2.0	8	2.2	51.9
Science	20	22.2	61	22.5	60	17.6	141	20.0	44	12.0	62.7
TOTAL	90	100	271	100	341	100	702	100	367	100	

TABLE X-III

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Student Lounge Use - Importance by Faculty (Reported in Students & Percent)

Central Academic

FACULTY	FACULTY USE										TOTAL FACULTY USE AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL STUDENTS SURVEYED
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW		TOTAL USE		DON'T USE		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Agriculture	6	3.5	5	1.6	5	2.3	16	2.3	5	1.4	53.3
Arts	40	23.5	71	23.2	44	20.4	155	22.4	68	18.4	58.5
Business Administration & Commerce	26	15.3	22	712	12	5.6	60	8.7	6	1.6	80.0
College St. Jean	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.3	0.0
Dental Hygiene	0	0	0	0	1	0.5	1	0.1	0	0	33.3
Dentistry	0	0	1	0.3	1	0.5	2	0.3	2	0.5	50.0
Education	34	20.0	58	19.0	46	21.3	138	19.9	123	33.3	44.7
Engineering	11	6.5	39	12.7	17	7.9	67	9.7	12	3.3	68.3
Graduate Studies	2	1.2	8	2.6	13	6.0	23	3.3	73	19.8	20.5
Household Economics	5	2.9	8	2.6	8	3.7	21	3.0	3	0.8	72.4
Law	0	0	1	0.3	1	0.5	2	0.3	10	2.7	14.3
Medical Laboratory Science	0	0	2	0.7	2	0.9	4	0.6	2	0.5	50.0
Medicine	1	0.6	0	0	7	3.2	8	1.2	14	3.8	34.8
Nursing	3	1.8	3	1.0	3	1.4	9	1.3	2	0.5	56.3
Pharmacy	1	0.6	0	0	2	0.9	3	0.4	4	1.1	20.0
Physical Education	1	0.6	8	2.6	6	2.8	15	2.2	7	1.9	53.6
Rehabilitation Medicine	3	1.8	6	2.0	7	3.2	16	2.3	6	1.6	59.3
Science	37	21.8	74	24.2	41	19.0	152	22.0	31	8.4	67.6
TOTAL	170	100	306	100	216	100	692	100	369	100	

on all 'other' on-campus lounge places, an accurate measure of use and satisfaction with true and proper campus decentralized lounge space was obtained. The decentralized list does eliminate Students' Union Building, Central Academic, off-campus space, etc., and deals only with proper student lounges chiefly in teaching buildings.

Use of proper decentralized lounges runs at only 9% of the survey sample which initially is a surprising result when read in connection with other parts of the lounge study (question 66) where smaller lounges are clearly preferred by many students. The explanation appears to be that the decentralized lounges (such as Tory basement) are often very crowded, and moreover are of a much lower quality (often located in older buildings) than either Central Academic Building or Students' Union Building. Many students reported lounging in library, locker rooms, free classrooms, V-wing carrel area, hallways and off-campus places.

(c) Lounge Satisfaction

By far the greatest satisfaction with on-campus lounge space was recorded with the new Central Academic Building lounge (Table XI-I). In this lounge exists the necessary spaciousness that many students are looking for. Crowding, therefore, doesn't appear to occur and environmental quality remains high. As the Central Academic Building lounge received use for only a short time prior to the commuter study, it is reasonable to assume that it will have a favourable impact on other lounges by relieving some of the congestion. Cameron Library basement student commons should possibly be reinstituted, however, to provide machine coffee and lounging to students after business hours in the

TABLE XI-I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Detailed Lounge Facilities Response

BUILDING OR LOCATION	IMPORTANCE USE OF FACILITIES	SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES					% TOTAL
	Rating	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Neither	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied	
EDUCATION LOUNGES	High	27.8	30.4	8.9	19.0	13.9	100
	Medium	9.4	61.2	9.4	15.5	4.3	100
	Low	5.5	45.5	33.1	11.7	3.9	100
	Don't Use	0.2	2.3	94.7	0.9	1.9	100
SUB LOUNGES	High	26.5	55.1	2.0	8.2	8.2	100
	Medium	11.8	63.2	13.2	10.5	1.3	100
	Low	3.1	46.3	31.9	15.7	2.9	100
	Don't Use	1.9	3.7	82.7	4.7	7.0	100
CENTRAL ACADEMIC	High	71.9	24.9	2.2	1.1	0.0	100
	Medium	30.0	63.3	5.2	1.5	0.0	100
	Low	20.0	54.7	22.9	2.0	0.4	100
	Don't Use	1.0	5.7	90.9	0.5	1.9	100
LOUNGES	High	32.2	44.1	10.2	10.2	3.4	100
	Medium	6.7	67.1	16.4	8.4	1.3	100
	Low	2.6	43.4	48.5	4.1	1.5	100
	Don't Use	0.7	3.1	94.5	0.0	1.7	100

Central Academic Building.

Satisfaction with Students' Union lounges is also high (Table XI-I) although for those students who find its use of high importance, a significant dissatisfaction rate of 16.4% was recorded. It would also appear that a portion of those students who don't use Students' Union lounges, do so out of dissatisfaction at 11.7%. This finding is quite different from the Central Academic Building study results, where only 2.4% of the don't users are dissatisfied. The student comments section of the report (Appendix I) will throw light on this situation.

Satisfaction with the Education lounges is lower than for the above two lounges, and the highest dissatisfaction rate (at 33%) for those that find the lounge of high importance was recorded. Subsequent parts of the report will show that this may be due to crowding, noisiness, and, possibly to a basement location.

Regarding campus decentralized lounges (Table XI-II) for those student using the lounges, satisfaction tends to run high, dissatisfaction a significant factor, and student users are either satisfied or dissatisfied there being a low "neither" response.

Lister Hall lounges satisfaction levels were recorded as high, adequately serving the residence students for residence oriented lounge use.

Residence students satisfaction with on-campus lounges runs 71% positive for Central Academic, (only 63% for Lister Hall lounges) 56% positive for Students' Union, and 22% positive (70% negative) for Education lounges.

TABLE XI-II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

DETAILED LOUNGE FACILITIES RESPONSE

BUILDING OR LOCATION	IMPORTANCE USE OF FACILITIES	SATISFACTION WITH FACILITIES					% TOTAL
	Rating	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Neither	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied	
LISTER HALL LOUNGES	High	35.7	44.6	8.9	8.9	1.8	100
	Medium	10.1	69.6	8.7	5.8	5.8	100
	Low	3.5	36.8	52.6	5.3	1.8	100
	Don't Use	0.4	1.5	95.3	0.4	2.5	100
OTHER DECENTRALIZED LOUNGES	High	37.7	40.3	6.5	5.2	16.4	100
	Medium	7.5	71.6	7.5	4.5	9.0	100
	Low	8.0	64.0	8.0	8.0	12.0	100
	Don't Use						

(d) Core Question And Comments

To the question, "If space were available, I would nap on campus," 38% of the student sample responded they would, while 50% said they wouldn't. Written comments by students however, indicated (by 56 comments to 18) that they would nap on campus if space were available.

In the case of comments on napping two significant factors came out. First napping is necessary and is a great relief to students on demanding schedules who cannot return home to nap; quote "Too much time is lost in going home and back, especially during and before exams. A 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. stretch is not unusual--a short nap would be appreciated, though."

The second apparent point is, however, that the significant quantity of napping that is already going on in campus lounges is upsetting many other students and taking up too much space, "Napping on campus is a complete waste of time and I do not approve of people taking up needed lounging space for themselves when there are others who would like to sit and talk."

An important integral facet to the first point above is that females like to nap in private female places, "For girls, its hard to take a nap in public. They should have private lounges for girls", and, "Now that Waunita lounge is open to the guys I will not nap there. I feel uncomfortable sleeping anywhere some guy walks by and thinks ah-ha-a BODY!!

It is therefore apparent in the above observations that napping is occurring and should likely occur out of the main stream of "public"

lounges in appointed places.

To the question, "I prefer bringing a lunch to buying food on campus", student responses were in favour by 58% to 19%. Comments supported this positive result. From the point of view of campus lounge space, however, the planners must therefore recognize that bag lunching is occurring in lounge areas with the unfortunate negative result of untidiness, etc. More bag lunch areas could be a solution.

42% of the students surveyed disagreed while 35% agreed with the question, "I try to avoid the Students' Union Building because of the crowds". When the 32% dis-use of the Students' Union Building lounges is recalled it would appear that crowds are a factor. Alternatively, however, many students definitely enjoy exposure to passing student crowds, indicating at least two opposite student lounge preferences.

Table XII provides information on question 69 ("What student services are inadequate or totally absent at the University of Alberta?") and indicates the relative importance of lounge space to the students surveyed. Lounging quite obviously rates very high. Please note that comments are broken down into survey sample I and II and into broad types of lounge facilities.

Comments regarding general lounge facilities fell into the following pattern.

> Lounge facilities seem to be too crowded and there are not enough of them; there is a lack of opportunity to communicate with the faculty in lounges; more intimate areas and more areas which would be strictly lounge areas far away from food services are needed.

One student commented, "New buildings should include departmental lounges

TABLE XII

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES IN AREAS OF COMPLAINT QUESTION 69, SAMPLE I & II

AREA OF COMPLAINT	SAMPLE I RESPONSE	SAMPLE I %	SAMPLE II RESPONSE	SAMPLE II %
A. Study Facilities	115	7.13	86	8.57
B. Eating	141	9.92	105	10.47
C. Lounge	186	12.53	129	12.86
D. Recreation	77	5.38	35	3.49
E. Service & Commercial	460	31.62	322	32.00
F. Environment	181	12.53	98	9.77
G. Academic	83	5.98	51	5.08
H. Transportation	194	13.37	155	15.45
I. Others	27	1.12	22	2.19
TOTALS	1,464		1,003	

C. LOUNGE FACILITIES		C. LOUNGE FACILITIES	
General Lounges	82	General Facilities	52
Nap Areas	24	Outdoors	17
Outdoors	23	Small Meeting Areas	16
Small Meeting Areas	16	Sleeping (Nap Areas)	15
Particular Buildings	14	Books & Records	12
Sub Facilities	12	Socials	7
Socials	8	Sub Facilities	6
Books & Records	7	Particular Buildings	4
TOTAL	186	TOTAL RESPONSES	129
% TOTAL COMMENTS	12.53	% TOTAL COMMENTS	12.86

for undergraduate students from the same department so they can meet to discuss their common problems and work on course material together with adequate facilities (i.e., desks and chairs without disturbing others)".

VI. Student Description of the Ideal Lounge

In the interests of focusing more clearly on the lounge needs of the University of Alberta students the following question was asked: "Describe what type of facility you consider ideal for relaxing, talking, and spending free time. Keep in mind such aspects as lighting, size, seating, food facilities (or their absence), location, atmosphere, etc." From the question has come a wealth of student information reported in Tables XIII-I -- XIII-II. The information presents the relative importance of component items relating to lounge size, lighting, furniture and decore, etc. This is followed by a brief written summary under the headings of lighting, size, etc., which in turn is followed by a positive and negative evaluation of exisitng lounges in campus buildings.

In conclusion, a few selected representative student comments regarding lounges complete study findings (Appendix I).

(a) Student Lounge Space Physical and Service Features Summary

LIGHTING

Most students seemed to prefer dim or subdued lighting. Some did indicate though, that they preferred adequate lighting, at least light enough to read by. A significant proportion (54) indicated they preferred lighting rather than sunlight. Overall there was a tendency to prefer lighting which was not unduly bright or harsh.

TABLE XIII-I

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Samples I & II Total Itemized Comments Question 66

	I	II	
LIGHTING			
Dim	84	66	150
Medium	52	56	108
Well	74	29	103
Natural	30	24	54
Reading	27	23	50
Soft	22	23	45
Indirect	8	6	14
Alternate	10	0	10
Colored	4	0	4
Warm	3	1	4

	I	II	
SIZE			
Small	123	108	231
Large	120	80	200
Medium	33	22	55
Partitioned	29	20	49
Any Size	2	4	6

	I	II	
FURNITURE & DECORE			
Comfortable Chairs	240	178	418
Tables	93	58	151
Seats/couches	88	27	115
Carpets	59	51	110
Windows	40	37	77
Paintings	19	14	33
Round Tables	12	21	33
Movable	12	18	30
Garbage Cans	18	10	28
Cushions	16	12	28
Ashtrays	18	8	26
Plants	20	4	24
TV	17	0	17
Fireplace	9	8	17
Varied	0	13	13
Drapes	4	8	12
Study Space	11	0	11
Footstools	5	5	10
Headphones	0	7	7
Low Ceiling	0	5	5
Style	4	0	4
High Ceiling	0	2	2
Indestructible	0	1	1

TABLE XIII-II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY

1970/71

Samples I & II Total Comments Question 66

FOOD	I	II	T
Snacks	143	80	223
Yes	89	81	170
Close By	89	65	154
Pubs	30	54	84
Drinks	42	32	74
No Food	28	29	57

LOCATION	I	II	T
Central	66	58	124
All Over	21	25	46
Accessible	21	5	26
Near Class	13	10	23
In Faculty	5	6	11
People Passing	5	2	7
Near Library	2	2	4
High Up	1	3	4
Off Campus	4	0	4
In Classrooms	0	3	3

ATMOSPHERE	I	II	T
Music	173	122	295
Quiet	105	86	191
No Crowds	55	61	116
Relaxed	47	53	100
Place to Talk	45	38	83
Airy	38	27	65
Out of the Way	29	33	62
Clean	42	16	58
Use of Colors	25	24	49
View	25	22	47
Privacy	26	18	44
Friendly	20	19	39
Place for Games	15	23	38
Nap Facilities	19	18	37
Open	13	16	29
No Smoking	13	16	29
Informal	16	11	27
Cosy	12	15	27
Cafeteria Like	12	13	25
Place for Sports	14	10	24
Place With People	8	12	20
No Music	2	18	20
Warm	8	10	18
Like Home	8	8	16

OTHERS	I	II	T
Prefer Outdoors	27	33	60
OK Now	33	24	57
No Need	11	22	33
Go Home	12	13	25
Misc.	0	3	3

SIZE

Although students listed "large" as a major preference, spaciousness or lack of crowds really seemed to be their top priority. In other words, they wanted resting places large enough to successfully handle the teaming multitudes who throng in lounges during certain times of the day. Many more students (231) wanted small lounges, with a substantial number of these suggesting lounges of a diminutive size spread over the campus --enough of these apparently to absorb the crowds. Some students (49) suggested partitions to subdivide large lounges into smaller more intimate areas.

FURNITURE AND DECOR

By far the top priority item in furniture was comfortable chairs, although few students took the opportunity to enlarge on what they felt to be comfortable. Some did mention though that the chairs in the Students' Union Building and the Central Academic Building were not really condusive to comfortable sitting, because of the lack of support for the area around the shoulders. A myriad of other amenities were also mentioned-- most of which are condusive to a clean, comfortable, stylish area.

FOOD

The majority of people desired the presence of food in some form or to some degree. 170 wanted food right on the spot with no qualifications whatever. 223 wanted light snacks (or vending machines) only. 154 wished to have food available but not on the premises. 84 wanted a PUB, with all its obvious components. 74 wanted accessibility to beverages only. 57 wanted no food whatever. In total it would appear that students would

like a clean split between their lounge and food facilities, although they would like some food and drink facilities in the area.

LOCATION

Centrality and accessibility appeared to be the major priorities for location. People seemed to want to be able to get to a lounge quickly and easily.

ATMOSPHERE

A quiet, congenial, subdued type of facility would appear to be the requisite in terms of atmosphere. Many people (295) listed music as their top priority, most of these specifying that this music be the relaxing type. The second priority--quiet, as indicated by 191 students is not really contradictory in keeping with the desired quiet kind of music. Most of the remaining points seem to support a restful respite from the daily clamour of campus life.

OTHERS

A significant number of students (60) mentioned they preferred the outdoors, and wished to have more areas (lawns, parks, benches, patio, etc.) where they could enjoy the fresh air during the limited part of the academic year when outdoor relaxation is possible. 57 mentioned that they felt outdoor facilities were fine now. 33 felt that students weren't here to spend their time in lounge type areas.

BUILDINGS MENTIONED

The lounge facilities in the Central Academic Building appeared to have the largest impact on people with 279 commenting favorably (Table XIV-II). The 55 who talked of the Central Academic Building in a

TABLE XIV - 1

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY 1970/71

CAMPUS BUILDINGS & LOUNGES MENTIONED - SAMPLE 1

CENTRAL ACADEMIC	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
In General	133	20
Cafeteria	19	3
SUB		
In General	51	34
Room At The Top	9	1
Blue Room	9	4
Music	12	1
Cafeteria	5	3
Meditation	1	0
Wauneita	3	0
Dinwoodie	0	2
Bookstore	1	0
Socials	2	0
2nd Floor	1	0
Art	9	0
BIO SCI		
4th Floor Cafeteria	12	0
Main	1	0
TORY		
14th Floor	13	3
Basement	8	9
PHYSICS	1	0
MATH	1	0
ARTS	9	3
CAMERON	3	1
GENERAL SERVICES	1	0
ED LOUNGE	18	9
PE	7	1
NEW ENG.	2	0
DEPARTED BUILDINGS	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
Tuck	4	0
Old Sub	1	0
Hot Cafe	1	0
RUTHERFORD	3	0
LISTER	18	0
ZORBA	4	0
FACULTY CLUB	2	0
U of C	12	0
HANNIGANS	1	0
	1	0

TABLE XIV - II

THE COMMUTING STUDENT STUDY 1970/71

CAMPUS BUILDINGS AND LOUNGES MENTIONED SAMPLE II

CENTRAL ACADEMIC	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
In General	146	35
Cafeteria	25	6
SUB		
In General	65	39
Ratt	14	1
Blue	11	1
Music	10	2
Cafeteria	8	2
Meditation Room	2	0
Wauneita	2	1
Dinwoodie	4	2
Bookstore	1	0
BIO SCI	19	4
TORY		
14th Floor	12	1
Basement	11	21
ARTS	7	1
CAMERON	6	5
EDUCATION		
Lounge	16	14
9th Floor	1	0
PHYS ED	11	1
DEPARTED BUILDINGS (RIP)		
Tuck	5	0
Old Sub	1	0
Hot Cafe	1	0
RUTHERFORD	4	2
ZORBAS	4	0
ALL OTHERS	7	1
U of Calgary	6	0
LISTER	3	0

negative way talked of the crowds, the dim lighting, and the uncomfortable chairs. Many of the 279 commenting favorably on the Central Academic Building talked of its spaciousness, its quiet, and the accessibility of food.

116 people mentioned the Students' Union Building in general, favorably: however, most didn't tend to enlarge on their reasons. The 73 who commented negatively talked of the crowds, the mess, and the uncomfortable chairs.

Biological Sciences was mentioned positively 32 times. Many people liked its comfortable surroundings and its view.

In the Tory Building, 25 people commented favorably on the Grad lounge. While 30 people comments negatively on the basement lounge, mentioning its crowds, mess, stuffy air, line ups and lack of size in relation to the demands of the building.

VII. Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

1. The study's paramount conclusion is that there is a shortage of student lounge space on campus in 1970/71. This observation is an over simplification of the problem which leads to point 2. Reference to informal student space in a report by Institutional Research and Planning, December, 1971, shows that enough additional lounge space is now under planning and development to alleviate the decentralized (but not necessarily the centralized) student lounge space shortage.

2. Present student lounges with the possible exception of Central Academic, to some degree, lack the physical and environmental qualities students "need" for proper relaxation and communication. Comfortable chairs, for

example, would help over 400 students in the study to relax better, not to mention what it would do for the total university enrolment. Throughout the study planners have been impressed by the students need for quality and efficiency of appointed spaces as time is a big factor. In short, an upgrading of existing student lounges with long life potential appears necessary. Good lounges can be further improved.

3. Certain student lounges should be expanded and possibly even relocated. Examples are Tory and Education basement lounges. For certain kinds of student lounges, windows offering a view make a world of difference such as Room at the Top (RATT) and the Biological Sciences fourth floor student lounge. The location of all student lounges should be reviewed as part of the above sort of systematic program.

4. Many students prefer lounges not too far removed from "snacks" or food availability. Central Academic appears perfect in this regard. Many other students prefer bringing a bag lunch (at least as a supplement) to be eaten near or in lounge areas. Still many other students prefer that the bag lunchers not turn lounges into an inevitable shambles of litter. In summary, the various aspects of the lounging-snacking-bag lunching should be recognized and planned for.

The study notes that many students would prefer an on-campus pub which could solve all three situations above for a good sized portion of the student market.

5. Although outdoor lounges were recorded as attractive, our severe winters make indoor lounges a necessity.

APPENDIX I

STUDENT COMMENTS

The following information represents written student comments regarding the ideal student lounge.

> Absence of straight back chairs - i.e., we should be able to recline if inclined. Spaciousness is good too not only in the physical size of the room, but it's bad to be trying to just relax and be subject to the constant chatter of some chatterbox behind you or the groans and sighs of oblivious lovers.
>
> The best places are usually those reserved for Profs such as top of Ed. building - a place where one can get good coffee and tea. However, I disagree that students should have these places because they abuse them. SUB was great when it was practically a second home to me spending up to 12 hours a day in it. The theatre lounge was a quiet clean place to relax and talk and now it is a pig sty. I blame this on lack of adequate facilities, but I contribute it also to my fellow students. There should be more cafeteria places on campus where students may have a cup of coffee and a place to sit and read or talk.
>
> ...Basement student storage is depressing, and upon talking to many young adults here, depression is a serious problem. Some live-in un-home-like "digs" or "pads" and have unsatisfactory relationships with landlords, roommates, parents, siblings, etc. A "sanity patch" could be a place for a breather.
>
> I think that the type of lounge needed for people to relax in should be fairly small with sound absorbing walls or walls that will not throw your words back at you. It should have some food facilities but something that is only a snack, like coffee and donuts or something like that. The atmosphere should be relaxing with cool lights in the room preferably a soft blue or green. There should also be soft music playing in the background. Very soft. It should not be in a basement unless it would be very well insulated. It should be away from crowds and large avenues which people use often. Some people might say why not play rock music, but I have found that the more rock music played the higher the pitch of conversation goes, so someone puts up the music so they can hear it, as a result, the voices get louder, etc., etc., until everyone walks out more tense than when they came in.

...Possibly each one should include an electric shocking device which will automatically shock the hell out of any slob using the couches for sleeping.

...Perhaps a kind of divided PUB in SUB or I guess a PUB where one can swing and listen to music.

...Lighting should not be very bright as it gives it the look of an all-night gas station.

...One supposes that the lounging area of the Central Academic Building is a sort of desirable prototype - it is large enough not to be constricting, light and airy. Moreover, the seating is so arranged that it is possible to have private or small group talks, without other groups or individuals impinging on one's consciousness - also, it is reasonably centred and hence is a convenient rendesvous spot - the food facilities are also within easy reach. However, it lacks the variety of SUB which in turn, suffers from a chaotic rush of itinerant students (to be avoided).

...The Meditation Room, for one, in the Students' Union Building is a pleasant environment conducive to discussion and relaxation. It has a built-in intimacy due to rugs, its controlled lighting, its stain-glass windows. But the problem here is that there are simple too many students using the facilities available. The theatre lobby in SUB for example, used to be a good place for relaxation and discussion, but now is dirty, crowded, extremely overtaxed; everyone wants to share part of a good thing, and, in the process, destroys it. That will continue to be the fate of every facility on this campus which has some attractive, human qualities about it. The winter is so long here: one cannot go out under a leafy tree in the quad to snooze, study, or nap in the sun. One must of necessity, come indoors.

...A quiet room with <u>no</u> background music, with slot machines for food available, I would like a lounge solely for mature students, eg., over 30 years.

...Each building should have a lounge big enough to accommodate the use and amount of students in that building. E.G., the HM Tory Building lounge in the basement <u>is NOT large enough</u> to accommodate the students who wish to partake of such an opportunity. This was poor planning considering the number of students using the building during the day. The number of students could have been estimated when considering planners knew how many classrooms there were and expected occupancy of such.

...Small, intimate rooms are most ideal for spending free time. Noise is one thing that is certainly annoying, and small, carpeted rooms make the noise less of a nuisance. Flourescent lights should not be used anywhere - they dehumanize people: soft natural lighting would be nice. Food facilities should not dominate areas where students spend their free time i.e., the cafeteria - a lot of people who use it are there to relax and not to eat so why have the mess-hall atmosphere. I think that the seating in the Arts lounge is probably the best that could be placed in an institutional lounge. The black leather "things" in SUB look nice, but they are uncomfortable. Music with volume control is often nice. If everything else about the lounge facilities was attractive I don't think that the location would be too important. I think that in planning lounge facilities there should be some space made available for people who want a relaxing quiet place to read, without being bothered.

...The lounges, in general, are too impersonal. The seats are positioned too symetrically that one feels bored.

...The ideal facility for relaxing and talking is a low-ceilinged, wood pannelled, draped room furnished with fat, comfortable chairs and hung with miscellaneous pictures. In lounges, one should be able to move the chairs about. The shape most conducive to relaxation is the circle. The severe, straight-line seating arrangements in SUB and in the Central Academic Building are cold and uninviting. Also, those couches are <u>impossible</u> to sit in: the back is too low and the seat too long. They are <u>most</u> uncomfortable. And why <u>black</u> chairs? How morbid! Lounges should have, gay, bright-colored furniture: food is fine.

...A place in which there is some sort of <u>vegetation</u> . For example, the Edmonton Public Library has small trees growing beneath skylights. Put a little life into all of those <u>dead</u> buildings!! A place where air is clean and free of smoke.

...The Central Academic Building is perfect. The lighting is good enough to study by. There is usually a seat someplace. The seats themselves make good beds if you want to take a nap. The location and atmosphere are both good. It is a main thoroughfare so you can see your friends if they are passing by. The food is available downstairs.

....Tuck Shop was a really cool place - cheap, good food, lots of people, close to campus, lots of room, and especially - atmosphere. Tuck was real collegey made you feel like a real student.